

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

By this amendment, claims 50, 54, 58, 62, 66, 70, 74, 78, 82, 86, 90, and 94 have been amended. Claims 50-97 remain pending.

Claims 50-97 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halbert-Lassalle in view of Lawrence. This rejection is traversed and is believed to be inapplicable to claims 50-97 as amended.

Each of the independent claims has been amended to recite that "the first data stream has data for demodulation for demodulating the second data stream." Neither of the Halbert-Lassalle and Lawrence references discloses or suggests such a feature.

As best illustrated in Fig. 3, the Halbert-Lassalle reference discloses a data transmission system in which a plurality of data sources are differentially encoded, inverse Fast Fourier transformed, transmitted, received, Fast Fourier transformed, and decoded. However, Halbert-Lassalle does not disclose or in any way suggest that any of the plurality of source signals includes data for demodulation for demodulating any of the other of the plurality of source signals.

The Examiner relied on Lawrence as a secondary reference for a teaching of the existence of BCH and Reed-Solomon error correction coding. However, Lawrence does not disclose or suggest a first data stream having data for demodulation for demodulating a second data stream. Accordingly, any combination of the teachings of Lawrence with the disclosure of Halbert-Lassalle would not include the claimed limitation of a first data stream having data for demodulation for demodulating a second data stream as recited in each of the independent claims of the present application.

In view of the above, it is submitted that it would not have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Halbert-Lassalle and Lawrence in such a manner that the apparatuses or methods recited in claims 50-97 of the present application would result. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 50-97 are allowable over the prior art of record and that the application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitsuaki OSHIMA

By: 

Jeffrey R. Filipek

Registration No. 41,471

Attorney for Applicant

JRF/fs
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 30, 2004